DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 706 HE 011 883

AUTHOR Tomei, Mario J.
TITLE Institutional Flexibility: The Glassboro State College Flexibility Index.
PUB DATE 13 Oct 78
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Northeastern Association for Institutional Research (Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, October 13, 1978); tables may not reproduce well due to light print of original

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Declining Enrollment; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; Program Development; Quotas; Retrenchment; *Seniority; *Staff Utilization; State Colleges; Tenure; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Flexibility Index; *Glassboro State College NJ

ABSTRACT

The development of a staff flexibility index at Glassboro State College is presented. It was an outgrowth of retrenchment problems for tenured faculty. Institutional flexibility was defined as the continuing ability of the institution to implement new or modify existing programs, employing a rationale that sees the ability to employ new faculty or redirect present faculty to meet staffing requirements for planned program implementation and development. Projections of faculty for three sets of steady-state conditions--least optimistic, most likely, and most optimistic--were made for a five-year period. Factors that were necessary components of the index were identified and all factors were ranked in one of five categories and assigned a relative weight to reflect the potential flexibility each factor gave to the development of an overall renewal index. Budgetary factors were considered and applied to the analysis. Four implications of the project are outlined, including modification of existing reward structure to encourage voluntary reassignment and the establishment of funds for eight guest lecturers/artists in residence. Three tables outlining the factors under each of the steady-state conditions are included. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE 011883

ED176706

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mario J. Tomei

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INSTITUTIONAL FLEXIBILITY:

THE GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE FLEXIBILITY INDEX

by

Dr. Mario J. Tomei
Professor, Educational Administration Department
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, N. J. 08028

A Paper Presented at the 1978
Conference, Northeast Association for
Institutional Research, Penn. State
University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

October 13, 1978

HE 011 883

CN001588

INSTITUTIONAL FLEXIBILITY: THE GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE FLEXIBILITY INDEX

Dr. Mario J. Tomei
Glassboro State College

BACKGROUND

In anticipation of steady-state or declining enrollments, many educators began to examine faculty staffing practices at their institutions. In New Jersey in the early 1970's, the immediate reaction by many administrators was to propose the establishment of quotas on tenured faculty.

At Glassboro State College in the Fall of 1972, the Board of Trustees proposed the establishment of specific quotas of tenured faculty for the purpose of maintaining institutional flexibility. The faculty raised strenuous objections. Challenged by the Board of Trustees to develop a positive plan that would help the institution maintain staff flexibility, the Faculty Senate proposed a Fourteen-Point Plan for Positive Action: Institutional Flexibility and Tenure Quotas. The Glassboro State College Faculty took the position in that document, that the establishment of tenure quotas did not automatically and simply increase institutional flexibility. Institutional flexibility was defined as "the continuing ability of the institution to implement new or modify existing programs; a rationale which sees the ability to employ new faculty or to redirect present faculty to meet staffing needs for planned program implementation and development." The focus of the document was on the recognition that there were a number of ways to produce new hires and that staffing needs based upon program planning could be projected.

As part of the planning process during 1977, Dr. Mark M. Chamberlain, Glassboro State College President, appointed a Task Force for Faculty/Staff Development. One charge to the Task Force was "to develop plans to enhance the flexibility of the college to meet new societal needs." A short time later the Council of State Colleges recommended that each college "develop staffing plans that included an institutional renewal index projected over the next five-

HE 011 883

year period." The Glassboro State College Board of Trustees while acting on personnel decisions at the end of the 1977 calendar year, charged the faculty "to devise a staffing plan that will enhance institutional flexibility and that will permit continued hiring of new faculty, some of whom will move forward to tenured positions."

With those statements and actions taking place, the Task Force for Faculty/Staff Development undertook the development of a staff flexibility index.

INTRODUCTION

The Task Force first examined all sources of faculty time that could be used to increase institutional flexibility. It then developed a staffing flexibility index to reflect the ability of the college to meet present and future instructional requirements over a five-year time span. (See Tables I, II and III)

Flexibility index projections enabled the Task Force to then develop strategies to increase the raw numbers reflected in factor categories and thereby increase college-wide flexibility over a five-year period.

Task Force Projections

The Task Force cast projections of faculty time for three sets of steady-state conditions: least optimistic, most likely and most optimistic. These projections assumed FTE budgeted enrollments for a five-year time span. They are consistent with past history and also reflect, as much as possible, socio-economic and other factors that could influence college enrollments. The number of budgeted faculty lines based on these enrollment projections was derived from the existing state budget formula.

Using the enrollment/faculty line base, the Task Force identified those factors that were necessary components of a staff flexibility index. Rather than focusing exclusively on the tenured/non-tenured distribution of full-time

faculty, it considered additional factors, ranked them in categories, and assigned a relative weight to reflect the potential flexibility each factor gave to the development of an overall renewal index. It then calculated a ratio that when applied to the number of budgeted faculty lines indicated a percentage of staff resource flexibility over the next five years based on the three sets of conditions noted previously.

Analysis of Flexibility Factors: Ranking and Assigned Weighting

Category I - Assigned Weight 1.0

Factors: Retirements
Resignations/Deaths
Non-reappointments

Rationale: Category I factors were assigned the heaviest weighting since these factors represent one-for-one replacement potential.

Category II - Assigned Weight .8

Factors: Temporary Part-time
Adjunct (Full-time Equivalent Faculty)

Rationale: These factors derive from State budgeted allocations, leaves of absences, sabbatical leaves and unfilled resignations and provide considerable instructional flexibility in combination with determinations made on Category I replacements. These lines can be re-allocated from semester to semester as well as year to year.

Category III - Assigned Weight .4

Factors: Overload (Full-time equivalent faculty) Special Funded Adjunct (Full-time equivalent faculty) Interdepartmental Assignment/Reassignment Capability

Rationale: The reduction in relative weighting between category II and III factors is based on the recognition that overload and special funded adjunct faculty are dependent on the number of faculty lines already allocated (including special funded lines) i.e., on the balance that has been struck administratively between replacement of lines on a one-for-one basis (Category I) and the use of temporary part-time and adjunct staff (Category II).

Further, the reassignment capability of present full-time staff is recognized as a means of achieving flexibility when particular faculty competencies and programmatic needs coincide.

Category IV - Assigned Weight .3

Factors: Special Funded Faculty (Headcount) Non-tenured Faculty

Rationale: Special funded lines provide flexibility, and Glassboro's record in securing outside funds has been very good. Special funded line dollars and their overload potential not only support the funded program, but often release staff to maintain present offerings as well as develop new programs. Since this factor varies with the nature of the

other state agencies to explore early retirement options.

3. Guest Lecturer - Permanent establishment of funds for eight guest lecturers/artists in residence. One year, full-time positions to be filled by outstanding persons to enhance or supplement existing or new programs.

4. Temporary Full-Time and Part-Time Teaching Time - Continued use and expansion of temporary full-time and part-time faculty to supplement and enhance regular faculty skills. Goal - - no more than 20% of teaching time on a temporary full-time and part-time basis.

It has been demonstrated that the development of a flexibility index has resulted in a reasoned approach to staff planning. However, staff planning must be tied to program planning, and strategies to enhance flexibility must be compatible with programmatic and instructional excellence. Only the best judgment, carefully exercised by administrators and faculty, can assure both flexibility and quality.

grant, the assigned flexibility weight is lower than for other factors. Non-tenured lines also offer some staffing flexibility. However, the specialized competencies of non-tenured faculty members reduce the weight that can be given to this factor.

Category V - Assigned Weight .1

Factor: Tenured Administrators

Rationale: Tenured administrators are a potential source of staff flexibility if their particular competencies can contribute to present or future programs. This factor represents a resource that can be utilized on a part-time or full-time basis and represents a temporary or permanent reassignment capability.

Examples of Implications of Projections

Flexibility index projections enabled the Task Force to develop strategies to increase the raw numbers reflected in factor categories and thereby increase college-wide flexibility over a five-year period. The following strategies are examples of Task Force recommendations based upon data generated from the Flexibility Index.

1. Reassignment of Faculty - Encourage faculty reassignment from low enrollment areas to other areas experiencing continued growth. Example - Modification of existing reward structures to encourage voluntary reassignment.
2. Early Retirement Incentives - Within limitations of pension statutes, civil service rules and regulations, etc., Board of Trustees should initiate discussions with Department of Higher Education staff and

TABLE I

CLARION STATE COLLEGE FLEXIBILITY INDEX
FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS
(THOUSAND DOLLAR CURRENT FUNDING)

FACTORS	WEIGHT	1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83	
		Items	Weighted Items	Items	Weighted Items	Items	Weighted Items	Items	Weighted Items	Items	Weighted Items
[illegible]	1.0	9	9	7	7	13	13	11	11	9	9
[illegible]	1.0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
[illegible]	1.0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
[illegible] (a)	.3	43	12.7	31	9.3	42	12.6	42	12.6	31	16.1
[illegible] (b)	.3	53	40	30	40	32	41.6	34	43.2	34	43.2
[illegible] (c)	.4	40	16.0	40	16.0	40	16.0	43	17.2	43	17.2
[illegible] (c)	1	32	32.0	32	32.0	32	32.0	32	41.6	32	41.6
[illegible] (c)	.3	6	1.8	6	1.8	7	2.1	7	2.1	8	2.4
[illegible] (c)	.4	1	.4	1	.4	2	.8	2	.8	3	1.2
[illegible]	.3	12	3.6	14	4.2	14	4.2	15	4.5	15	4.5
[illegible]	.4	19	7.6	20	8	22	8.8	22	8.8	23	9.2
[illegible] (c)	.1	12	1.2	12	1.2	13	1.2	14	1.4	14	1.4
[illegible] (c)		10,402		10,365		10,402		10,130		10,130	
[illegible]		7,710		7,700		7,710		7,800		7,800	
[illegible]		11,237		11,161		11,237		11,330		11,330	
[illegible]		7,710		7,700		7,710		7,800		7,800	
[illegible] (f)		362		360		362		364		364	
[illegible]			130.3		131.9		144.4		147.2		170.2
[illegible]			38.2		36.64		39.89		40.44		41.86

(a) Special Funding Included (b) Headcount (c) Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (d) With Faculty Rank (e) Headcount
(f) Headcount, State Funded With Rank

TABLE II

[illegible] PUBLIC COMMUNITY UNIVERSITY CENTER
[illegible]-YEAR PROJECTIONS
(WITH APPROPRIATE WORLD EXISTING PROJECTIONS)

PROGRAMS	FTE Ratio	1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83	
		Sixteen	Twenty-Sixteen	Sixteen	Twenty-Sixteen	Sixteen	Twenty-Sixteen	Sixteen	Twenty-Sixteen	Sixteen	Twenty-Sixteen
[illegible]	1.0	9	9	9	9	11	11	11	11	9	9
[illegible]	1.0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
[illegible]	1.0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
[illegible] (a)	.3	49	14.7	44	13.2	41	12.3	44	13.2	36	24
[illegible] (b)	.3	50	40	52	15.6	54	16.2	54	13.2	50	16.4
[illegible] (c)	.4	40	24.0	43	17.2	41	16.8	41	16.8	44	17.6
[illegible] (d)	.3	50	40.4	52	41.6	52	41.6	53	42.4	53	42.4
[illegible] (e)	.3	7	2.1	7	2.1	8	2.4	8	2.4	9	2.7
[illegible] (f)	.4	2	.8	2	.8	3	1.2	3	1.2	4	1.6
[illegible] (g)	.3	14	4.2	11	4.3	16	4.8	16	4.8	16	4.8
[illegible]	.4	23	9	22	8.8	24	9.6	26	10.4	26	10.4
[illegible] (h)	.3	17	5.1	13	5.3	14	5.4	14	5.4	11	5.1
[illegible] (i)		20,000		22,040		20,000		20,000		22,000	
[illegible]		7,900		8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000	
[illegible]		11,237		11,401		11,000		11,000		11,741	
[illegible]		7,710		7,900		8,000		8,000		8,000	
[illegible] (j)		360		360		374		374		378	
[illegible]			142.4		144.1		178.5		178.5		167.2
[illegible]			39.34		39.95		42.44		42.34		44.23

(a) Special Funding Included (b) Headcount (c) Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (d) With Faculty Rank (e) Headcount
(f) Headcount, State Funded With Rank

TABLE XXX

[illegible]

[illegible]	Notes	1970-71		1971-72		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83	
		Lines	Square Lines	Lines	Square Lines	Lines	Square Lines	Lines	Square Lines	Lines	Square Lines
[illegible]	1,2	9	9	7	7	12	12	11	11	9	9
[illegible]	1,2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
[illegible]	1,2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
[illegible] (a)	2	49	24.7	29	4.7	25	6.3	4	1.2	4	1.2
[illegible] (b)	2	40	20.0	30	24	29	24	30	24	30	24
[illegible] (c)	2	40	16.0	31	14	28	16	30	12	30	12
[illegible] (d)	2	40	40.0	45	35	40	30	35	25	35	25
[illegible] (e)	2	5	1.5	5	1.5	4	1.2	4	1.2	4	1.2
[illegible] (f)	2	1	.4	1	.4	0	0	0	0	1	.4
[illegible] (g)	2	17	3.4	10	2.0	10	2.0	0	0.4	0	0.4
[illegible]	4	19	7.6	18	7.2	16	6.4	14	6.4	17	6.8
[illegible] (h)	2	11	1.4	10	1.0	9	.9	0	.8	0	.8
[illegible] (i)		18,003		3,504		3,006		3,504		18,000	
[illegible]		7,150		7,000		1,000		7,000		7,000	
[illegible]		11,237		10,704		5,332		5,332		10,230	
[illegible]		7,750		7,300		4,200		4,200		7,000	
[illegible] (j)		362		342		320		320		327	
[illegible]			177.9		104.0		102.0		91.0		91.0
[illegible]			21.47		20.03		16.01		17.76		19.47

(a) Special Purpose Included (b) Upstream (c) Multi-Line Equivalent Density (d) Disk Density Item (e) Downstream
(f) Upstream, Disk Packed Disk Item